BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08656 835 7

7608
131

No. 7608.131

THE TRVSTEES OF THE
PVBLIC LIBRARY
OMNIVM
LVX
CIVIVM
OF THE CITY OF
BOSTON
1852 · 1878

From 8605.69
133956
Public Library
—of the—
City of Boston
8608.134

A BRIEF HISTORY

OF

FRANCIS FAUVEL GOURAUD,

WHO IS ABOUT TO BAMBOOZLE THE (VERDANT?) BOSTONIANS WITH AN EXPLODED SYSTEM OF ARTIFICIAL MEMORY.

BY S. H. BRANCH.

BOSTON, JANUARY 1, 1845.

1923
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

TO THE PEOPLE OF BOSTON AND THE UNITED STATES.

On the 27th February, 1840, a Frenchman, calling himself Francois Gouraud, arrived at the Tremont House, Boston.

He was preceded by considerable reputation, from having stated in New York, that he was a pupil of the celebrated chemist, Daguerre, of Paris, and that he came to this country under the auspices of that gentleman, to diffuse a knowledge of Photography, then recently discovered by him, and since more generally known, by the name of Daguerreotype.

He was permitted to make a public exhibition of his sketches in the drawing rooms of the Hotel, and afterwards exhibited them in the Hall of the Horticultural Society. Admittance 25 cts.

In April, 1840, all the sketches, plates, and effects placed by Gouraud in the Horticultural Rooms, were attached at the suit of the landlord of the house where he boarded in New York, with whom he had left sundry trunks and boxes of effects, as security for the payment of the bill of board.

In this dilemma, Gouraud addressed himself to a person residing in the Tremont House, who, like the other gentlemen boarders, had treated him with civility, asking advice and assistance which were granted. Bail was given, and the attachment raised.

Gouraud asserted that the trunks and boxes in New York contained articles of great value, and made an assignment of them to the person who became his bail; in consequence of which, and relying on the good faith of Gouraud, he neglected to take an assignment of the property in the Horticultural Rooms which, it afterwards appeared, belonged chiefly to persons in Paris, one of whom, impatient at receiving no remittances for goods intended to be sold, followed him to this country, and obtained restitution of part of his property after various quarrels and delays.

Perceiving that the resources of Gouraud were diminishing, the person who was his bail, sent a young friend, resident in New York, accompanied by Gouraud, with means to discharge the landlord's bill, and redeem the objects left in pledge with him, which was done, and the effects sent to Boston, when it was found that a great part consisted of wearing apparel, and other objects which, under pretence of necessary personal use for himself and family, Gouraud contrived to retain, and what remained was not worth half the money advanced. The balance, and sundry sums lent at various times to relieve him from the greatest distress, remain unpaid, and he soon after left Boston without giving notice of his intended departure. He subsequently induced the young gentleman, who assisted in settling his accounts with his New York landlord, to enter into a project with him for taking Daguerreotype views of the falls of Niagara; and the records of the courts of Upper Canada show his baseness, duplicity and black ingratitude in that affair.

He still owes the person already mentioned, as having frequently assisted him in distress, an important sum; he owes the landlord of the Tremont House, a considerable amount; he owes others for money lent, things bought and services rendered, all of which, notwithstanding his system of Mnemonics, he has forgotten to pay, otherwise than by a notice from the United States District Court of New York, declaring that John Baptist Francis Fabien Gouraud is a Bankrupt, dated February 25th, 1843.

This man, whose whole career in the United States, has been of *duplicity, fraud, malevolence*, and *black ingratitude*, intends to present himself to a Boston audience, as a lecturer on a subject which he has filched from others, and

presents as his own;—a subject, too, that has been thoroughly condemned, together with himself, wherever he has had the audacity to introduce it, as the following documents incontestibly prove. S. H. BRANCH.

Boston, Jan. 1st, 1845.

From the Philadelphia Enquirer.

A meeting of the male citizens, consisting of members of Prof. Gouraud's classes on Mnemonics, was held at the Lecture Room of the Museum on Saturday evening. Samuel Merrick, Esq., presided, and several gentlemen acted as Vice Presidents and Secretaries. Speeches were made by Judge Barton, the Hon. C. Naylor, and several other gentlemen, expressive of dissatisfaction at the result of the system as taught in Philadelphia. A series of resolutions, adverse to the system, and indicating strong disappointment on the part of those present, were adopted.

From the United States Gazette, Philadelphia.

At a meeting of the adult male members of the late class of Prof. Francis Fauvel Gouraud, held at the Lecture room of the Philadelphia Museum, George Street, below Ninth, on Saturday evening last, pursuant to public notice, for the purpose of expressing an *honest* opinion upon the merits of his system of Phreno-Mnemotechny, as lately taught by him in this city, on motion of J. C. Vandyke, Esq., the following named gentlemen were appointed officers of the meeting.

PRESIDENT.

SAMUEL V. MERRICK, Esq.,

President of the Franklin Institute.

VICE PRESIDENTS.

Reynell Coates, M. D., Algernon S. Roberts, Esq., Prof. R. M. Huston, Hon. Chas. Naylor, Samuel Murphey, M. D., Chris. Fallon, Esq., G. W. Woolsey, Esq., Paul T. Jones, Esq.

SECRETARIES.

J. B. Beers, William Cheeks.

The advertised call of the meeting having been read from the chair, and its objects briefly stated by the Chairman, the following preamble and resolutions were submitted for the consideration of the meeting, by James B. Beers, Esq., one of the Secretaries. After having been discussed at great length by a number of gentlemen, they were almost unanimously adopted, but very few of the great number present, voting in the negative.

Whereas, having attended the course of Lectures delivered by Prof. Francis Fauvel Gouraud, upon his so-styled science of "*Phreno-Mnemotechny*," to his several classes in Philadelphia, we believe it to be our duty, by a candid expression of opinion, to caution the inhabitants of other cities, into which the Professor may hereafter seek to introduce it, against being imposed upon by his magnificent pretensions—by the flattery of a portion of the public press, but, more especially, (as we have been,) by the complimentary resolutions said to have been adopted by his classes in New York, upon the completion of his course in that city. Therefore,

1. Resolved, That Professor Gouraud, as well in his introductory lecture, as in his printed prospectus, pledged himself to "prove to his auditors, upon their own testimony, that the learning of any of the series of facts composing the programme of his lectures, would not require any serious effort of mind; and that the committing to memory of some of the most difficult problems of the lecture programme could be effected with the mere attention of a careful perusal," and that nothing was required but "attention and a few leisure hours during a couple of weeks."

3. Resolved, That Prof. Gouraud further pledged himself, in his prospectus, (which was extensively circulated prior to the formation of his classes,) to demonstrate the "universal application of the system;" and that he enumerated as among "the various branches of human knowledge" to which it could be applied, the following; extracted, literally, from his prospectus:

"*Chronology:* of sacred and profane History, Ancient and Modern. *Biography* —ibid *Geography:* Physical, Mathematical, Astronomical, and Nautical. *Astronomy:* Cosmographic, Geodesic, Nautical, etc. *Chemistry and Mineralogy* in all their various branches. *Medical Sciences:* Pathology, Therapeutics, Physiology, etc. *Anatomy:* Myology, Osteology, Nervrology, etc. *Pharmacopea:* Chemical and Medical. *Zoology:* Mammalogy, Ornithology, Icthyology, Conchology, Anthomology, etc. *Botany:* General and Medical. *Fine Arts:* Numismatics, Archeology, etc. *Phrenology; Mathematics; Statistics; Natural Philosophy; Jurisprudence;* POETRY, LINGUISTICS, INDUSTRIAL and COMMERCIAL SCIENCES, etc., etc."

3. Resolved, That in the printed *programme* of his course of lectures, which accompanied the prospectus, referred to in the preceding resolutions, Professor Gouraud pledged himself to impart to his classes the knowledge of an "immediate and practical application of the system" to a great variety of the branches of human knowledge specified in his prospectus; and that, among others, he *especially* promised (by printing the promise in capital letters,) that in the "fifth lesson," he would illustrate its "Commercial and Business Applications."

4. Resolved, That Professor Gouraud has failed to redeem the foregoing pledges. That although it is true that the advantages of his system, such as they are, may be attained without any "serious" effort of mind, one of a most *ludicrous* character is required, the tendency of which, we believe, must be to impair the mental tone, by compelling the pupil to commit to memory a series of "formulæ" either of unmeaning jargon, or puerile combination; That it is impossible that the committing to memory of some of the most difficult problems of the Lecture Programme can be effected with the mere attention of a careful perusal;" but that, on the contrary, they require a degree of attention, application, and patience, to render the system serviceable, which few persons engaged in business would be willing or able to bestow.

3. Resolved, That, instead of demonstrating the "*universal* application of his system," Professor Gouraud convinced us of its inapplicability to the purposes of general reading and literature: That, as far as explained by him, it can be applied only to nomenclatures, statistics, the mere chronology of history and events, and such portions of science as are connected with figures: That many even of these restricted applications, are extremely defective: That the *process* by which the results of the system are to be attained, is too tedious, and frequently too complicated, to admit of its habitual adoption: and that the general reader who should attempt to reduce the system to practice upon an extensive scale, would soon find himself compelled, in our opinion, to abandon it, and only rely upon his natural memory, cultivated and strengthened by the only practically available discipline, that of *attention and exercise.*

6. Resolved, That in his course of lectures delivered in this city, Professor Gouraud so far violated the good faith which he owed to his pupils, that he not only did *not* "demonstrate" the application of his system to "the various branches of human knowledge" enumerated in his prospectus, but that he did not even make the *attempt* so to do: That confining his applications to a few of them, and those the least important, he passed over the remainder without a word of remark: That by comparing the printed programme of his lectures, with the lectures themselves, we find that he omitted even to touch upon many

of the most prominent topics therein set forth: That he did not bestow a passing notice upon the "*commercial and business applications of the system:*" and that all the information which he *did* impart upon any subject, might easily have been imparted in two or three lectures of about one hour each in length, if he had confined himself to his subject, instead of taxing the patience of his hearers, as he did, by interminable reference to the greatness of his discoveries, elaborate panegyrics upon the merits of his system, and promises of what wonders he *would perform* upon some future occasion.

7. Resolved, that we disclaim all personal unkind feelings to Prof. Gouraud; but having found that his *rare pretensions* are entirely unsupported by his merits, a sense of duty alone actuates us to endeavor thus to place upon their guard, those who might otherwise be deceived, as we have been.

8. Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the several papers of this city, and in at least, one paper in Baltimore and Boston each.

From the United States Gazette, Philadelphia.

To the Public.

☞Professor Gouraud, now lecturing in this city, on *Phreno-Mnemotechny*, has publicly branded me through the entire union as a quack,—with having violated my sacred honor, and with every species of odium. In rebutting these serious charges, I will simply lay before the public a plain statement of facts. Some time since, I advertised to teach Mnemonics, a favorite art with me, and to which I had long directed my attention. Being unjustly assailed by Prof. Gouraud, I resolved at once on his thorough exposure of Plagiarism. I established the fact to the entire satisfaction of the millions west of the mountains. I then repaired to New York, where I gave two lectures, which of course were principally attended by Prof. Gouraud's former pupils. The following is the result of my first lecture, as published in the New York Tribune, through which Prof. Gouraud has been accustomed to severely denounce me.

Professor Branch's Lecture on Mnemonics.

☞At a large and respectable meeting of Ladies and Gentlemen of this city, held last evening at the Stuyvesant Institute, composed chiefly of the pupils of Prof. Gouraud, assembled in pursuance of an advertisement of Prof. Branch, the following Resolution was adopted, and ordered to be published:

Resolved, That this meeting consider the address of Prof. Branch, delivered this evening, as being a perfect exposition of the Plagiarism of Prof. F. Fauvel Gouraud—that such address shows, by fair and conclusive argument, and by a comparison of the Two Systems of Mnemotechny by the audience, that a perfect similarity exists between the Fundamental Mnemonic Basis and detail of the system of Aime Paris and the basis and detail of the system which Prof. Gouraud has copy-righted and claims to be his own discovery.

DANIEL BREED, Chairman.

The following, from the Now York Express, is the result of my 2nd lecture.

GOURAUD'S PLAGIARISM.

Prof. Branch delivered another lecture last evening, at the Society Library, before a large and brilliant assembly, composed chiefly of Professor Gouraud's former pupils, in Mnemotechny. At the close of the lecture, Dr. C. A. Lee rose, and moved that a meeting be organized, by the appointment of Dr. Miller Chairman, and Andrew B. Miller, Secretary, which was adopted. The following resolutions were then presented by A. Scott, Esq., and passed.

Resolved, As the sense of this meeting, that Prof. Branch has most conclusively shown, that the system of "Phreno-Mnemotechny," as lately taught in this city by Prof. Gouraud, and *copy-righted* under his own name, is substantially that invented *solely* by Aime Paris, and first published at Paris, in the year 1823, under the title of "The principles and different applications of Mnemotechny," by Aime Paris.

Resolved, That the "Phreno-Mnemotechnic Dictionary," copy-righted by Prof. Gouraud, and published under his name, as sole author and proprietor, is substantially the Dictionary of A. M. D. Castillio, and J. F. Castillio, pupils of Professor Paris, and that the only alteration consists in substituting, in some instances, such English words for the French words, as contain the same articulations.

Resolved, That a Committee of Five be appointed by this meeting, who shall, for the further satisfaction of the public, examine fully the details of the systems of Professors Paris and Gouraud, and report at their earliest convenience, through some of the public newspapers.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be published.

JACOB S. MILLER, M. D., Chairman.

A. B. MILLER, Secretary.

Since my discovery in this country of Aime Paris's work on Mnemonics, and the dictionary of the Castillios, it seems that Prof. Gouraud—and those editors who first heralded him as the first genius of the age—contends that he never claimed the system as his own, but that he invented it in *connection* with Paris. If this were true, why is Gouraud's name not even mentioned by Paris in any of his works? Paris, too, was a cotemporary of Feinagle, forty years ago, and first published his discovery of the ten articulations to the world in 1823, 21 years ago. Now Mr. Gouraud is only about 35 years old.

How could he then have been the cotempotary of old Mr. Paris, 40 years ago, or even have invented the Fundamental Basis in *connection* with him 21 years ago? But even admitting, for the sake of argument, that Gouraud did in part invent the Fundamental Basis, what right has he to copy-right it in his own name? And why, I ask, does he not produce the books in French, that he pretends to have published 20 years ago? The fundamental basis of the system is the same in most languages, and does not of course admit of translation; but even if it did, he could not legally copy-right it in this country on that ground alone.

The fact that Prof. Gouraud has copy-righted the fundamental basis, ought to be sufficient to prove that he has claimed the system as his own invention from the beginning; but in order to establish the fact beyond peradventure, it is only necessary to quote from the full, authorised report of Gouraud's first introductory lecture at the New York Tabernacle, which was reported by Col. Stone himself, and published in his own paper, the Commercial Advertiser. Amie Paris is not even mentioned in the report, but the system of Gouraud, fundamental basis and all, are claimed to be exclusively his own invention.

"The Tabernacle, (says the Commercial,) was filled throughout with one of the most respectable auditories we remember a lecturer ever to have drawn together; and the gratified hearers made no secret of the pleasure they received from the exhibition of Mr. Gouraud's successes in the "ART HE HAS INVENTED."

In the next sentence, Gouraud is made to say that his *system* had no *analogy* with any of which his *audience might have knowledge*. Again, the Report says, that having abundantly satisfied his audience that none of these systems

(meaning the systems of Grey and Feinagle) would answer, the Lecturer proceeded to adduce evidence that "HIS OWN SYSTEM," was *practicable* and *easy*. And the evidence well supported the plea—the most sceptical must have been convinced that Mr. Gouraud has made a *discovery* as to the cultivation of the memory, that will prove of incalculable benefit to mankind."

Prof. Gouraud, *after* he had received $10,000 from his 2,000 pupils in New York, fearing the discovery of the works of Paris and Castillio, very artfully, in the preface of his dictionary, *published not long since*, gives *some credit* to Paris, for *some ideas*. And these *ideas* it seems, are to mean nothing more nor less than the basis and detail of Paris's system, and the dictionary of the Castillios.

But Gouraud also very artfully pretends, on the first page of the *first edition* of his printed lessons, to have drawn a comparison between his system and that of Paris, at the introductory Lecture at the Tabernacle. How, I ask, could he have pointed out the difference between two precisely similar systems? Such comparison would have led to his own exposure at once,—would have made a corpse of the new and *most astonishing idea* he so often impiously affirmed suddenly dropped from the clouds into his own mind, during a morning ramble among the mountains. If he had ingenuously told his audience, that his system was precisely the same as that of Aime Paris, invented twenty-one years ago, he would not have got 2,000 pupils. Such a *comparison* of the two systems, would have utterly destroyed the context of the report of Colonel Stone, in which he labored throughout to prove that the system of Gouraud was a new discovery of his own.

But as incredible as it may seem, it is *now* even contended that Aime Paris' work, and the dictionary of the Castillios, were introduced at the Tabernacle, when the pretended *comparison* is said to have been made.

If such were the fact, why are the pupils of Gouraud, and the entire country, so astounded at my discovery and introduction of these books *now?* Stephen Brown, M. D., C. A. Lee, M. D., and formerly Professor of Natural Sciences in New York University, and even Mr. Hoyt, himself, a Theological Student, who was formerly the associate of Gouraud, and who is praised in the highest terms in the preface of his dictionary, have given me certificates, certifying that the books in question were not introduced at the Tabernacle, nor even during the entire course of lessons.

Finally, why don't Prof. Gouraud come out with those "Phreno-Mnemotechnic principles," which he promises, in the preface of his dictionary, his pupils will soon have in hand? Why don't he come out and show where "we meet—he and I—where we *differ* and *disagree?*" meaning himself and Paris.

He dare not make that comparison. He knows he never has, and never can make it. He never intended to make it, until he had humbugged this entire Union.

He knows that there is but one Mnemonic system, having for its basis, se, te, ne, me, re, le, she, ke, fe, pe and that that belongs to Aime Paris, who is now very poor in Switzerland.

This illustrious man, in his old age, has been robbed of his works and his fame. Will the American people tolerate this? I think not. "Let justice be done, though the heavens do fall."

I refer to J. C. Montgomery, Esq., Post Master of this city, for a knowledge of my character.

S. H. BRANCH.

Philadelphia, May 27th, 1844.

From the New York Express.

To the Public--Phreno-Mnemotechny.

The Committee appointed at a meeting of the adult members of Professor Gouraud's late classes in "PHRENO-MNEMOTECHNY," held at the New York Society Library, May 24th, 1844, beg leave to submit the following Report:—

1. They have fully investigated the charges of plagiarism, brought against Prof. G., with the works in their possession from which he is said to have learned his system, and they find, what has been lately fully admitted, that the system, as taught by him, is that of Feinagle, as modified by J. Amie Paris; he "*having done in English what the latter had previously done in French.*"

2. The Committee are of opinion, therefore, that Prof. G. has not given that degree of credit to Feinagle and Paris to which they are justly entitled, and the system of Feinagle, as given by Prof. G. in his "printed lessons," in order to "demonstrate its impracticability," differs essentially from that which has always gone under the name of Feinagle's system.

3. With respect to the credit of having originated a *Phreno-Mnemotechnic Dictionary*, the Committee find, that besides the Dictionary of Castillio, published in 1823, other Dictionaries of a similar kind have appeared previous to that period; among others, one by the late J. R. Murden, of this city, published in 1818. From the very nature of the subject, such works must be 'identical' in plan, to as great an extent even as common English Dictionaries are, and the question of plagiarism, in any particular case, is absurd.

4. The system of Mnemonics, as taught by Prof. G., like all other systems of artificial memory, has no tendency whatever, in the opinion of the Committee, *to strengthen the memory*; but on the contrary, may possibly have a directly contrary effect if frequently resorted to—just as walking on crutches from early childhood would prevent the full developement of the muscular strength and the physical powers generally. The memory can only be improved by those intellectual exercises, which are calculated to strengthen and develope all the mental faculties.

5. The Committee believe that systems of artificial memory are of little use to the public generally, and will not repay the time, labor and expense necessary for their acquisition. They are, however, perhaps of some service to those who deal in statistics, as public lecturers, who teach sciences into which dates and figures largely enter. They do not believe they can be successfully applied to the acquisition of 'languages, prose, poetry, &c.,' and even if they could, the labor and time which the application would require in order to derive from them any advantage, are altogether disproportioned to the benefit attainable, and therefore will not be encountered.

6 With respect to the particular value and applicability of Prof. G's. system of Phreno-Mnemotechny, the committee can only express their own individual opinion, which is, that the importance of the system has been overrated by the public generally. In their own experience, they have not found the assurances verified, viz: that 'the learning of any of the series of facts composing the programme of the lectures, would not require any serious effort of mind,' or, that the committing to memory of some of the most difficult problems of the lecture programme, 'could be effected with the mere attention of a careful perusal,'—or, that nothing was required but 'attention and a few leisure hours during a couple of weeks,' or that the system was 'of universal application to the whole circle of sciences.' On the contrary, they have found that it required a degree of attention, application and patience to render the system serviceable, which they do not possess, and few persons engaged in business would be willing or able to bestow—that the *process* by which the results

of the system are to be attained, is too tedious, and frequently too complicated to admit of habitual adoption—*that it requires a very good memory to begin with*, in order to make the system available to any considerable extent; in short, that the general reader, who would attempt to reduce the system to practice upon an extensive scale, would soon find himself compelled to abandon it, and only rely upon his natural memory, cultivated and strengthened by the only practically available discipline, that of attention and exercise.

Respectfully submitted,
CHARLES A. LEE, M. D.
JAMES FANNING.
A. B. MILLER.

From the Louisville Journal, Kentucky.

Imposture.—Professor Gouraud, a Frenchman, recently introduced into New-York a new science, which he called Mnemotechny, and of which he claimed to be the inventor. Professor Branch, a pupil of Gouraud, recently advertised to teach the system here. Thereupon Gouraud, through the New York papers, fiercely denounced Professor Branch, and claimed that, as the system was his own, and, as he had a copy-right for the "fundamental basis," &c., no body had a right to teach it but himself, and such persons as he might choose to accredit.

Professor Branch replies to Professor Gouraud through our paper of to-day. We have had an opportunity of examining the volume of Mnemotechny, which was published in France in 1825, and to which Professor Branch alludes. The system is identical with that which Gouraud calls his own, and which he claims to have exclusive right to teach.—Professor Gouraud's much boasted "fundamental basis" is, with the exception of a single most insignificant alteration, exactly the same as that published in 1825. The man is a most impudent and brazen-faced pretender and thief, who deserves to receive from the thousands that he has imposed upon, one united kick, potent enough to send him back all the way across the Atlantic.

From the Louisville Dime.

Mnemotechny.

The high reputation which the New York press has given M. Gouraud, not only as a successful cultivator of the science of Mnemonics, but as a gentleman of high toned honor and virtue, led us to feel an interest in what we deemed at the time, the discovery of Mnemonics, by Professor Gouraud. We regret to say that the editorial fraternity of New York have been imposed on, and that so far from being the discoverer of this science, he proves to be a plagiarist of the deepest dye. We have seen it charged upon him that his system was based on Feinagle's and Gray's, but we knew that it differed widely from those attempts, in certain essential features. But is it not a little remarkable, that in a city where French literature is so much cultivated as in New York, no one should have compared the *discoveries* of M. Gouraud with the *labors* of Aime Paris, published in 1825. To the publication made by Prof. Branch, in the Louisville Journal, a few days since, we are indebted for a sight of Amie Paris's work on Mnemonics, and the immense discoveries of M. Gouraud dwindle into the merest larceny.

When the fundamental basis of the system, published by Professor Branch, appeared in Cincinnati, a native of Switzerland, in that city, produced the work of M. Paris, published in 1825, in the city of Paris. It is entitled "*Exposition and practice of Mnemonical proceedings, for the use of those per-*

sons who wish to study Mnemotechny in general, as a means of shortening the study of human knowledge, by Amie Paris." The motto is, "Nature, simple in her general rules, employs a great variety of means." *Malte Brun.* Precis de la Geog. univ. tom. 2, liv. 35, A. Paris, chez l'auteur, rue des Grands—Augustons, No. 17, vis-a-vis de la rue Christine, 1825.

It is evident that the system of M. Gouraud, is taken bodily from the joint labors of Paris & Berbreugger. This we are assured by a friend (not Prof. Branch) who knows Gouraud's system, and who has carefully examined the work of Paris. For the sake of those editors in New York who have held up Gouraud as a Paragon of excellence, and who were afraid to publish Gouraud's fundamental basis, for fear of the copy-right law, we publish the fundamental basis of Paris printed in France nearly twenty years ago. We give them leave to publish this as the work of Paris, and they may feel secure against any legal process from M. Gouraud.

Paris's Fundamental Basis.

Te-Ne-Me-Re-Le-She-Ke-Fe-Pe-Se
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

Let our New York friends compare this with Gouraud's basis, and they will find the only alteration made by Prof. Gouraud, is in changing Zero from right to left.*

Paris borrowed, and acknowledged it, 100 points of remembrance from Feinagle, and Gouraud gets from these his *homophonic equivalents* with which he classifies the formulas of the ratio. See Paris's work, page 177.

The testimony is perfectly clear to our mind, that Gouraud has practiced a gross imposition on his large classes in New York, by teaching the system of Paris as a discovery of his own. His copy-right is a nullity.

From the New York Herald.

Mnemotechny and its Professors, Gouraud and Branch.

The public are aware this subject has excited a good deal of interest in this city and the country, and through the efforts of Professor Gouraud attached no small degree of apparent importance to the matter. About the same time that Gouraud was lecturing in this city, Professor Branch, who has come on here was similarly employed in the west, between whose systems it appears there is not much difference. In one respect, however, there is a difference between the two Professors. Mr. Branch avows his to be Amie Paris' system, with some improvements, while Gouraud claims that taught by him as his own. On this point of difference, we have obtained some information by the perusal of Professor Branch's lecture in manuscript, recently delivered here, in which he undertakes to prove that the paternity of the system belongs to Amie Paris, and not to Professor Gouraud, who, as he says, unjustly claims it.

After examining the lecture on this subject delivered by Professor Branch, we think that he clearly attains his object, which was to prove that Gouraud is not the author of the system which he lately introduced in this city, and which made such a noise for the time. It appears that Amie Paris, so far back as 1825, published in Paris a volume on this subject, and that previous to him Feinagle had propounded and taught the science; that Castillio's dictionary was known also long before the Professor began to teach the system. In Mr.

* This Fundamental Basis was taken from Paris's edition of 1825. But in the edition of 1834, Zero is placed first: thus, Se, Te, Ne, Me, Re, Le, She, Ke, Fe, Pe. It was from this edition, that Gouraud took his entire system, and copy-righted it as his own.

S. H. B.

Branch's lecture, there were introduced certificates from Mr. Hoyt, of the New York Theological Seminary; Dr. Lee, Dr. Stephen Brown, and many other gentlemen of this city, which went to prove that the system of Gouraud is identical with that of Paris, and that at the introductory lecture at the Tabernacle, Gouraud did not introduce the above mentioned works, as stated by some of the press of this city. These certificates are of unquestionable worth, and go to prove that Gouraud claims a system as his own which is identical with that propounded by Amie Paris; and of this Professor Branch convinced his audience; for, at the close of his lecture, a meeting was organized, and resolutions passed to that effect.

In alluding to this matter we have abided by a plain statement of facts. As to the system itself, all the noise and fuss it has created has not been sufficient to persuade us of its importance. Systems of memory are very old, far older than they have proved useful. Every one has a system of memory of his own, and rigid self discipline, will be found the best if not the only efficient teacher. We think that metaphysical evidence can be brought to prove that the memory mainly depends upon mental organization; that it is subject to the same natural laws of gradual growth as the other mental functions; that it is not amenable or under the control of certain rules of art, and that all efforts to produce artificial memory suitable to every mind must prove abortive, and is only another name for philosophical quackery.

From the New York Herald.

THE NEW YORK EDITORS IN A CLEFT STICK—PHRENO-MNEMOTECHNY AND SELF-STULTIFICATION.—A very amusing document, or bulletin has just been published in several of the papers, and signed by many of the editors and *attachés* of the daily press, which exhibits a more laughable case of calm, cool and philosophical self-stultification than any thing we have heard of since the late "Dear Dick Riker" signed, in the benevolence of his heart, a petition to his own court to send him to Sing Sing for ten years, under the supposition that he was signing his name to a poor devil's application for an office. This delectable document is signed by the following philosophers :—

Wm. B. Townsend, Ed. N. Y. Express.
Charles King, Ed. N. Y. American.
M. M. Noah, Sunday Messenger.
John Inman, Ed. N. Y. Com. Adv.
Horace Greely, Ed. Tribune.
H. J. Raymond, Ed. N. Y. Courier and Enquirer.
Parke Godwin, Ed. N. Y. Evening Post.
Henry Latrade, Redacteur Cour des Etats Unis.
Frederic Galliardet, (absent) Ed. do.
S. De Witt Bloodgood, True Sun.
Thomas McElrath, of Tribune.
George M. Snow, do.
John Milhau.
James Mackay, Ed. New World.
J. N. Reynolds, *attaché* to somewhere.
Russell Jarvis, Philadelphia Ledger —

and purports to certify to the general fact, that Professor Fauvel Gouraud is not the original inventor of the famous phreno-mnemotechnical system which has made so much noise of late, but that he adopted the idea from Feinagle and Amie Paris, adding some developements of his own.

Now this is a funny confession from the newspaper philosophers, who have been savagely maintaining for many months past, that Professor Gouraud was

the principal inventor o em of egg hatching—we mean mnemonising, (both of which are, howe ike,)—and calling his rival, Prof. Branch, as many hard names ould think of, for putting forwa·d the same idea. Indeed, the whole y on this subject, in a philosophical aspect, has been the most la d childish we have ever seen—and it has now terminated as it began seasoned mixture of mock dignity and broad farce. In one way, t has been interesting—and that is in its financial aspect. Professor as made many thousand dollars by his lectures on a system of mem which he will remember with gratitude as long as he lives, without any particular system at all.

The philosophy of memory is clear enough. All general systems are general pieces of charlatanism. A particular system of memory in every mind, "grows with its growth and strengthens with its strength"—but in no two human beings is it alike—or can be made alike. To take a full grown mind and attempt to introduce a new system of memory, is much the same as to unlearn one's whole life—unthink our past thoughts—and go back to a second childhood. We think this operation of the famous phreno-mnemonical system is particularly illustrated in the childish and silly document signed by the newspaper philosophers. They have signed a certificate of their second childishness.

From the Cincinnati Atlas.

Mnemotechny.

A man by the name of Gouraud in New York, calling himself *professor*—has been greatly puffed and lauded by the papers of that city, as the discoverer of new laws of the human mind, called Mnemotechny, or the Art of Memory. We have all along considered him an empiric, and his discovery a humbug—for several reasons—among which was the circumstance of his treating his discovery as a mystery—laying his pupils under injunctions of secrecy—and the charlatan exhibitions and displays he made, to gull the credulous citizens of New York.

He published a book, which he *copy-righted* as original, but which turns out to be borrowed almost entirely, as we are informed, from the work of a Swiss, or French author, by the name of Amie Paris. No people on the globe are so fond of being humbugged as the Americans—Mesmerism and Phreno Magnetism have just had their day, and as if the people had not paid enough for being gulled, they eagerly lay hold of this new imposture and form themselves into classes of two thousand at a time, to be again duped and again filched.

(From the Cincinnati Enquirer and Message.)

Matchless Impudence.

Professor Gouraud, a Frenchman, who is enlightening all the east with a new system of teaching, which improves the memory and makes lasting every impression, has published certain other professors of the same science or system as vile impostors, and warns the public against their infidelity to himself as their teacher and their tricks of imposition upon the people. He also pretends to have been the original inventor of the system, and has actually copy-righted his book in the United States as his own. The fellow is not only a literary impostor himself, but he is a *thief*—beyond all question he is. Day before yesterday Professor Branch called upon us with a French gentleman, and showed us a book published in Paris, in 1825, being the system at large, which Gouraud now teaches and pretends to have invented. Every feature of the two corresponds. What a noble specimen of manliness.

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.